Constant factor Approximation Algorithms for Uniform Hard Capacitated Facility Location Problems: Natural LP is not too bad *

Sapna Grover[1], Neelima Gupta[2], and Aditya Pancholi[3]

1 **Shivaji College, University of Delhi, India.**
sapnagrover@shivaji.du.ac.in
2 **University of Delhi, India.**
ngupta@cs.du.ac.in
3 **University of Delhi, India.**
aditya.cs.du@gmail.com

arXiv:1606.08022v5 [cs.DS] 21 Apr 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we give first constant factor approximation for capacitated knapsack median problem (CKM) for hard uniform capacities, violating the budget only by an additive factor of f_{max} where f_{max} is the maximum cost of a facility opened by the optimal and violating capacities by $(2+\epsilon)$ factor. Natural LP for the problem is known to have an unbounded integrality gap when any one of the two constraints is allowed to be violated by a factor less than 2. Thus, we present a result which is very close to the best achievable from the natural LP. To the best of our knowledge, the problem has not been studied earlier. For capacitated facility location problem with uniform capacities, a constant factor approximation algorithm is presented violating the capacities a little $(1+\epsilon)$. Though constant factor results are known for the problem without violating the capacities, the result is interesting as it is obtained by rounding the solution to the natural LP, which is known to have an unbounded integrality gap without violating the capacities. Thus, we achieve the best possible from the natural LP for the problem. The result shows that natural LP is not too bad. Finally, we raise some issues with the proofs of the results presented in [4] for capacitated k-facility location problem (CkFLP). [4] presents $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ approximation violating the capacities by a factor of $(2+\epsilon)$ using dependent rounding. We first fix these issues using our techniques. Also, it can be argued that (deterministic) pipage rounding cannot be used to open the facilities instead of dependent rounding. Our techniques for CKM provide a constant factor approximation for CkFLP violating the capacities by $(2+\epsilon)$.

1998 ACM Subject Classification F.2 Analysis of Algorithms and Problem Complexity.

Keywords and phrases Capacitated Knapsack Median, Capacitated k -Facility Location

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Facility location problem (FLP) is one of the widely studied problems in computer science and operational research. The problem is well known to be NP-hard. In this paper, we study the capacitated variants of some facility location problems for hard uniform capacities. In particular, we study the capacitated knapsack median problem (CKM) and capacitated facility location probelm (CFLP). Knapsack median problem is a generalization of the well known k-median problem. The natural LP for knapsack median is known to have an unbounded integrality gap [6] even for the

* This work was partially supported by University of Delhi Research Grant.



© Sapna Grover, Neelima Gupta and Aditya Pancholi;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

uncapacitated variant of the problem. Krishnaswamy *et al.* [9] showed that the integrality gap holds even on adding the covering inequalities to strengthen the LP, and gave a 16 factor approximation that violates the budget constraint by an additive factor of f_{max}, the maximum opening cost of a facility in optimal. Kumar [10] gave first constant factor approximation without violating the budget constraint. Kumar strengthened the natural LP by obtaining a bound on the maximum distance a client can travel. Charikar and Li [7] reduced the large constant obtained by Kumar to 34 which was further improved to 32 by Swamy in [11]. Byrka *et al.* [5] extended the work of Swamy to obtain a factor of 17.46. To the best of our knowledge, the capacitated variant of the problem has not been studied earlier. Natural LP for capacitated k-median is known to have an unbounded integrality gap when any one of the two constraints is allowed to be violated by a factor less than 2 [1]. The hardness result holds for CKM as well. We give first constant factor approximation for the problem violating the capacities by $(2+\epsilon)$ and budget only by an additive f_{max} where f_{max} is the maximum cost of a facility in the optimal. Thus, we present a result which is very close to the best achievable from the natural LP. In particular, we give the following result:

▶ **Theorem 1.** *There is a polynomial time algorithm that approximates hard uniform capacitated knapsack median problem within a constant factor* $(O(1/\epsilon^2))$ *of optimal violating the capacities by a factor of* $(2+\epsilon)$ *and budget only by an additive factor of* f_{max} *where* f_{max} *is the maximum cost of a facility in the optimal for a fixed* $\epsilon>0$.

Next, we present a constant factor approximation for capacitated facility location problem (CFLP) with uniform capacities violating the capacities a little, by $(1+\epsilon)$. Standard LP is known to have an unbounded integrality gap for the problem. However, the example [8] breaks when the capacities are allowed to be violated a little. In particular, for a fixed $\epsilon>0$ if we allow the capacities to be violated by a factor of $(1+\epsilon)$, then the gap is bounded by $O(1/\epsilon)$. Though constant factor results are known for the problem without violating the capacities [2, 3], our result is interesting as it is obtained by rounding the solution to the natural LP. [2] is based on local search techniques whereas [3] rounds the solution to a very sophisticated LP. Our result shows that natural LP is not too bad. In particular, we give the following result:

▶ **Theorem 2.** *There is a polynomial time algorithm that approximates hard uniform capacitated facility location problem within a constant factor* $(O(1/\epsilon))$ *of optimal violating the capacities by a factor of at most* $(1+\epsilon)$ *for a fixed* $0<\epsilon<1/2$.

Finally, we raise some issues with the proofs of the results presented in [4] for capacitated k-facility location problem (CkFLP). Byrka *et al.* in [4] presents $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ approximation violating the capacities by a factor of $(2+\epsilon)$ using dependent rounding. We fix the issues using our techniques. Also, it can be argued that (deterministic) pipage rounding cannot be used to open the facilities instead of dependent rounding. Our techniques for CKM provides similar result for CkFLP in a straight forward manner violating the cardinality by plus 1. We will show that the cardinality violation can be avoided. Thus we present the first deterministic constant factor approximation for the problem violating the capacities by $(2+\epsilon)$. Aardal *et al.* [1] gave a constant factor approximation when the facility costs are uniform using $2k-1$ facilities.

High Level Idea: We borrow some tools and techniques from [4]. Facilities and demands are partitioned into clusters, a binary tree structure is defined on the centers of clusters and meta-clusters(MCs) are formed as in [4]. A cluster is classified as *sparse* or *dense* depending on whether the demand served by it is small or large. A new LP is used to open facilities in sparse and dense clusters. Using the properties of extreme point solutions, a solution is obtained with at most two fractionally opened facilities. Both the fractional facilities are opened integrally at a loss of plus f_{max} in budget. Connection costs are bounded separately for sparse and dense clusters. (This helps us resolve the issues in [4].) Min-cost flow is then used to obtain integral assignments.

Our algorithm for knapsack median works in three stages. Stage I comprises of clustering and meta-clustering and is largely same as that presented in [4]. In stage II, we transform our solution into what we call as *pseudo-integral* solution. A solution is said to be *pseudo-integral* if at most two facilities are opened fractionally. It is then transformed into an integrally open solution in stage III.

Organization of the paper: We first present our algorithm for knapsack median in section 2 reviewing some of the the techniques used in [4] for $CkFLP$ in sub-section 2.1 and highlighting the modifications we make at the end of the sub-section. Sub-sections 2.2 and 2.3 present stage II and stage III respectively of the algorithm. Section 3 presents the algorithm for $CFLP$. We fix the issues raised with respect to [4] using our techniques and also discuss how the techniques can be used to provide a deterministic solution for the problem in section 4.

2 Capacitated Knapsack Median Problem

In knapsack median problem , we are given a set of clients $\mathcal{C}$, a set of facilities $\mathcal{F}$ and a real valued distance function $c(i, j)$ on $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{C}$ in metric space. Each client j has some demand associated with it, each facility i has an opening cost f_i, and we have a budget $\mathcal{B}$. The goal is to open a set of facilities and assign demands to them so as to minimize the total connection cost subject to the constraint that the total facility cost of the opened facilities is at most $\mathcal{B}$. When $\mathcal{B}=k$ and $f_i=1$, problem reduces to the k-median problem. In capacitated knapsack median, each facility i also has an associated capacity u_i which limits the maximum amount of demand it can serve. We deal with the case when $u_i = u\ \forall i$ and demands are unit and, denote it by *unifCKM*. The Integer Program (IP) for instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, c, f, u, \mathcal{B})$ of *unifCKM* is given as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\textit{Minimize} \quad \mathcal{C}ostKM(x,y) = \textstyle\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} c(i,\, j) x_{ij} && && \\
&\textit{subject to} && \textstyle\sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} x_{ij} = 1 && \forall\ j \in \mathcal{C} && \\
& && \textstyle\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}} x_{ij} \le u\ y_i && \forall\ i \in \mathcal{F} && (1)\\
& && x_{ij} \le y_i && \forall\ i \in \mathcal{F},\, j \in \mathcal{C} && (2)\\
& && \textstyle\sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} f_i y_i \le \mathcal{B} && && (3)\\
& && y_i,\, x_{ij} \in \{0,1\} && \forall\ i \in \mathcal{F},\, j \in \mathcal{C} && (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

LP-Relaxation of the problem is obtained by allowing the variables y_i and x_{ij} to be fractional. Call it LP_1. Let LP_{opt} denote the cost of optimal solution. For an LP solution $\sigma = <x, y>$, $j \in \mathcal{C}$ and a subset T of facilities, let $size(y, T) = \sum_{i\in T} y_i$ denote the total extent up to which facilities are opened in T, $\mathcal{A}_\sigma(j, T) = \sum_{i\in T} x_{ij}$ denote the total assignment of j on facilities in T.

To begin with, we guess the facility with maximum opening cost, f_{max}, in the optimal solution and remove all the facilities with facility cost $> f_{max}$ before applying the algorithm. The algorithm runs for all possible choices of f_{max} and the solution with minimum cost is selected. This can be done in polynomial time because there are only $|\mathcal{F}|$ choices for f_{max}. As we build upon the techniques of [4] (for CkFLP), we present a brief overview of them in section 2.1. We also raise some issues in the claims and proofs presented in [4].

2.1 Overview of the techniques used in [4] for CkFLP

In CkFLP, instead of budget $\mathcal{B}$, we have a bound k on the maximum number of facilities that can be opened. The goal is to open facilities within the bound and assign clients to them so as to minimize the total facility opening cost and connection cost subject to capacity constraint.

To begin with, sets of facilities and demands are partitioned into clusters at a loss of constant factor in cost. Let $\sigma^* = <x^*, y^*>$ denote the optimal LP solution. Let $\hat{C}_j$ denote the average connection cost of a client j in σ^* i.e. $\hat{C}_j = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} x^*_{ij} c(i, j)$. Let $l \ge 2$ be a fixed parameter and

ball(j) be the set of facilities within a distance of $l\hat{C}_j$ of j *i.e.* $ball(j)=\{i\in\mathcal{F}: c(i,\ j)\leq l\hat{C}_j\}$. Then, $size(y^*,\ ball(j))\geq 1-\frac{1}{l}$. Let $\mathcal{R}_j=l\hat{C}_j$ denote the *radius* of *ball(j)*. Consider the clients in non-decreasing order of their radii. Let $S=\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}'=\phi$ and j be a client with smallest radius $\mathcal{R}_j$ in S, breaking ties arbitrarily. Add j to $\mathcal{C}'$ and delete it from S. $\forall j'\in S$ with $c(j,\ j')\leq 2l\hat{C}_{j'}$, remove j' from S and let $ctr(j')=j$. For each $j\in\mathcal{C}'$, define cluster $\mathcal{N}_j$ as the set of facilities to which j is *nearest* amongst all the clients in $\mathcal{C}'$; that is $\mathcal{N}_j=\{i\in\mathcal{F}\,|\,\forall j'\in\mathcal{C}': j\neq j'\Rightarrow c(i,\ j)<c(i,\ j')\}$ assuming that the distances are distinct. j is called the *center* of the cluster. Thus, $\mathcal{C}'$ is the set of cluster centers. Note that $ball(j)\subseteq\mathcal{N}_j$ and the sets $\mathcal{N}_j$ partition $\mathcal{F}$. Any two cluster centers j and j' satisfy the *separation property* : $c(j,\ j')>2l\ max\{\hat{C}_j,\hat{C}_{j'}\}$. Let l_i denote the total demand of clients in $\mathcal{C}$ serviced by facility i *i.e.* $l_i=\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}x^*_{ij'}$ and, $d_j=\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}l_i$. Move the demand d_j to center j of the cluster. The cost of moving the demand is bounded by $2(l+1)LP_{opt}$ (Lemma (2.6) of [4]).

▶ **Lemma 3.** *[4] Let $j\in\mathcal{C}'$ and $i\in\mathcal{N}_j$ then, (i) For $j'\in\mathcal{C}'$, $c(j,\ j')\leq 2c(i,\ j')$, (ii) For $j'\in\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{C}'$, $c(j,\ j')\leq 2c(i,\ j')+2l\hat{C}_{j'}$, (iii) For $j'\in\mathcal{C}$, $c(i,\ j)\leq c(i,\ j')+2l\hat{C}_{j'}$ and (iv) $\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}'}c(j,\ j')\mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j',\mathcal{N}_j)\leq 2(l+1)LP_{opt}$.*

Let $\mathcal{C}_S$ be the set of cluster centers for which the total opening is less than 1 and $\mathcal{C}_D$ be the set of remaining centers in $\mathcal{C}'$. The clusters centered at $j\in\mathcal{C}_S$ are called *sparse* and those centered at $j\in\mathcal{C}_D$ *dense*. Define $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}=\cup_{j\in\mathcal{C}_D}\mathcal{N}_j$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}=\cup_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S}\mathcal{N}_j$. A tree structure is defined on the cluster centers as follows: for $j\in\mathcal{C}'$, let $\eta(j)$ be the nearest other cluster center in $\mathcal{C}'$, of j. A tree consists of client centers as nodes and $(j,\ \eta(j))$ as directed edges. In case, there is a 2 length cycle at the root, one of the cycle edges is removed arbitrarily. Note that the in-degree of a node may be unbounded in this structure. These trees are converted into binary trees using the standard procedure after sorting the children of node $j\in\mathcal{C}'$ from left to right in non-decreasing order of distance from j. Let $\mathcal{T}'$ denote the new tree obtained and $\sigma(j)$ be the parent of j in $\mathcal{T}'$. Its easy to show that $c(j,\ \sigma(j))\leq 2c(j,\ \eta(j))$ and the edge costs decrease as we go up the tree. Also, the in-degree of root is at most 1.

Next, clusters are grouped in what we call as meta-clusters(MCs) so that facilities in each MC can be opened independently of the facilities in other MCs and all except at most u units of demand of a MC can be satisfied within the MC with capacities scaled up by a factor of $2+3/(l-1)$. MCs are formed by processing the nodes of a tree $\mathcal{T}$ in a top-down greedy manner starting from the root. To form a new MC, let r be a topmost node in $\mathcal{T}$ not yet grouped. Include r in the new MC, denote it by G_r. Let j be a node not yet grouped, include j in G_r such that j has the cheapest edge connecting it to some node in G_r *i.e.* $j=argmin_w\{c(w,\ v)\in\mathcal{T}: v\in G_r$ *and* w *is not yet grouped*$\}$. MCs are formed of size l (if possible) and these nodes are removed from further consideration in the formation of MCs. There may be some MCs with fewer nodes than l, towards the leaves of the tree. With a slight abuse of notation, we will use G_r to denote the collection of centers of the clusters in it as well as the set of clusters themselves. Let $\mathcal{H}(G_r)$ denote the subgraph of $\mathcal{T}$ with nodes in G_r. The subgraph $\mathcal{H}(G_r)$ is converted into a chain of clusters loosing a factor of $O(l)$ on distances. Let the new structure be denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(G_r)$.

An *almost integral* solution (having at most one fractional facility) is obtained within each cluster by truncating the openings from y^*_i to $z_i=\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}x^*_{ij'}/u$ and, greedily transferring the openings and assignments to facilities in non-decreasing order of $f_i+uc(i,\ j)$. Authors claim that certain properties (definition 5 in the paper) are satisfied by this solution. However, this is not true. In particular properties (iii) and (iv) are not satisfied[1].

[1] In a personal communication, authors provided modified versions of the properties viz. (iii') For any $j\in\mathcal{C}'$, the total opening in $\mathcal{N}_j$ of y^* $(size(y^*,\mathcal{N}_j))$ is at least $1-1/l$ and (iv') Let $j\neq r$ be a node in a tree $\mathcal{T}'$ such that the cluster S_j has only one facility i with positive opening say y'_i. Then, $(1-y'_i)d_jc(j,\ \sigma(j))\leq 16b^c_j$. Now, it is not clear what is y'_i. It is not clear whether the almost integral solution is obtained from z or from y^*_i. If property (i) of Definition 5 is correct (authors make no mention of that in their personal communication), then almost integral solution z' is obtained from z. y' is not same as z' as communicated in the personal communication.

A tree structure is defined on the MCs as follows: a tree consists of MCs as nodes and there is an edge from a MC G_r to another MC G_s, if there is a directed edge from root r of G_r to some node $s' \in G_s$. G_s is then called the parent MC of G_r and the edge (r, s') is called the *connecting edge* of the child MC G_r. If G_r is a root MC, add an edge to itself with cost $c(r, \sigma(r))$. This edge is then called the *connecting edge* of G_r. Note that the cost of any edge in G_s is less than the cost of the connecting edge of G_r which is further less than the cost of any edge in G_r.

Next, it is shown that if fractional facilities (at most one in each cluster) are paired up in a top down manner, dependent rounding is applied on them preserving the sum of openings y'_i (or the truncated openings? is not clear from the paper; dependent rounding will not work with truncated openings), then the demand d_j of $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$ can be assigned to facilities in clusters whose center is within $O(l^2)c(j, \sigma(j))$ distance from j, within factor $(2+\epsilon)$ violation of capacities. However, it is not clear how the cost of transporting the demand d_j from j to $\sigma(j)$ and $(2+\epsilon)u$ units of demand from the center to the facilities opened in the cluster are bounded. We will show that this can be done using our techniques in section 2.2.

Next, we present our rounding algorithm for CKM. Stage I of our algorithm comprises of clustering and meta-clustering and is same as that presented in this section except that we redefine *sparse* and *dense* clusters based on the amount of demand they serve rather than the total openings *i.e.* for $j \in \mathcal{C}'$, we say that $\mathcal{N}_j$ is *sparse* if $d_j < u$ and *dense* otherwise. We continue to use $\mathcal{C}_S$ and $\mathcal{C}_D$ to denote the set of cluster centers of sparse and dense clusters respectively. We also redefine $\eta(j)$ as: for each cluster center $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$, let $\eta(j)$ be the nearest other cluster center in $\mathcal{C}'$, of j and for $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, $\eta(j) = j$. Trees on cluster centers and those of MCs are then formed in the same way. Note that with this definition of $\eta(j)$ there is at most one dense cluster in any MC, and if present, it is always the root cluster of a root MC. Also, we work with $\mathcal{H}(G_r)$ instead of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(G_r)$.

2.2 Stage II: Obtaining a pseudo-integral solution

Sparse clusters have the nice property that they need to take care of small demand (less than u each) and dense clusters have the nice property that the total opening within each cluster is at least 1. These properties are exploited to obtain the claimed bounds. We define a new LP which provides us with a solution having at most two fractionally opened facilities. Before proceeding any further, we present the following results borrowing the notations from the previous section, to motivate us to define our LP.

▶ **Lemma 4.** *Let $j' \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}'$ such that $c(j, j') \leq \mathcal{R}_j$, then $\mathcal{R}_j \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{j'}$.*

Proof. Suppose, if possible, $\mathcal{R}_j > 2\mathcal{R}_{j'}$. Let $ctr(j') = k$. Then, $c(j', k) \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{j'}$. And, $c(k, j) \leq c(k, j') + c(j', j) \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{j'} + \mathcal{R}_j < 2\mathcal{R}_j = 2l\hat{C}_j$, which is a contradiction to separation property. ◀

▶ **Lemma 5.** $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} d_j \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} c(i, j) x^*_{ij} \leq 3 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} c(i, j) x^*_{ij} = 3LP_{opt}$.

Proof. $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} d_j \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} c(i, j) x^*_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \left(\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) \right) \hat{C}_j$
$= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \left(\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}: c(j,j') \leq \mathcal{R}_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) \hat{C}_j + \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}: c(j,j') > \mathcal{R}_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) \hat{C}_j \right)$
Second term in the sum on RHS $< \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}: c(j,j') > \mathcal{R}_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) c(j, j')$
$\leq \frac{1}{l} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}': c(j,j') > \mathcal{R}_j} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij'} (2c(i, j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'})$
$\leq \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}': c(j,j') > \mathcal{R}_j} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij'} (c(i, j') + 2\hat{C}_{j'})$. Thus the claim follows. ◀

▶ **Lemma 6.** $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_S} d_j \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j) x^*_{ij} + c(j, \eta(j)) \left(1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij}\right)\right) \leq 6LP_{opt}$.

Proof. The second term of LHS $= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_S} d_j \left(\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{N}_j} c(j, \eta(j)) x^*_{ij} \right)$
$\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_S} d_j \left(\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}': j' \neq j} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{j'}} c(j, j') x^*_{ij} \right) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_S} d_j \left(\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}': j' \neq j} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{j'}} 2c(i, j) x^*_{ij} \right)$. ◀

Hence, we have the following:

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j\Big(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} c(i,\,j)x^*_{ij}+c(j,\,\sigma(j))\Big(1-\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij}\Big)\Big)\leq 12LP_{opt} \tag{5}$$

Next, we define our new LP so as to open sufficient number of facilities in each MC such that the opened facilities are well spread out amongst the clusters (at most 1 (sparse) cluster has no facility opened in it) and demand of a dense cluster is satisfied within the cluster itself. One way to do this is to open $\lfloor d_j/u\rfloor$ facilities in a dense cluster centered at j and q_r-1 facilities in sparse clusters of a MC with q_r sparse clusters in it. The demand of the sparse cluster $\hat{j}$ in which no facility is opened, is assigned to facilities opened in clusters above it. If $\sigma(\hat{j})$ is a dense cluster centered at j then $d_{\hat{j}}$ must be assigned in $\mathcal{N}_j$. This works well in all the scenarios except when d_j is nearly (but less than) $2u$. In this case it leads to capacity violation of 3 factor. The main observation here is that in this case, we may be able to open one more facility in the cluster centered at $\hat{j}$ or j. To be able to do so, we separate these two clusters from the remaining set of clusters in the meta-cluster so that the openings in the cluster of $\hat{j}$ are not utilised more than once.

For a MC G_r, let p_r and q_r denote the number of dense and sparse clusters in G_r and let $t_r=p_r+q_r$. Let j_d be the center of the dense cluster (if any) in G_r and j_s be the center of the first sparse cluster (if any) included in G_r. G_r is considered in two parts: G^1_r and G^2_r. G^1_r essentially consists of j_d and possibly j_s which must be in $\mathcal{C}_S$. G^2_r consists of the remaining clusters in G_r which must be all sparse. Let γ_r denote the number of facilities that will be opened in G^1_r and q'_r be the number of cluster centers in G^2_r, then q'_r-1 will be the number of facilities that will be opened in G^2_r.

Next, we explain how to partition G_r into G^1_r and G^2_r. Choose l such that $1/l<\epsilon$. For $j\in\mathcal{C}_D$, let $res(j)=d_j/u-\lfloor d_j/u\rfloor$. We begin by setting $G^1_r=\{j_d\}$ and $G^2_r=G_r\cap\mathcal{C}_S\setminus\{j_s\}$, $q'_r=\max\{0,q_r-1\}$. Whether j_s will be handled with G^1_r or with G^2_r will be decided soon. There are two possibilities with respect to $res(j_d)$:

1. $res(j_d)<\epsilon$: set $\gamma_r=\lfloor d_{j_d}/u\rfloor$, $G^2_r=G^2_r\cup\{j_s\}$, $q'_r=q'_r+1=q_r$.
2. $\epsilon\leq res(j_d)<1$: For $q_r\geq 1$, we must have $res(j_d)+size(y^*,\,\mathcal{N}_{j_s})\geq 1$. Set $G^1_r=G^1_r\cup\{j_s\}$, $\gamma_r=\lfloor d_{j_d}/u\rfloor+1$ and, set $\gamma_r=\lfloor d_{j_d}/u\rfloor+1$ if $q_r=0$.

These two cases will be referred to, throughout the paper (in particular, in Lemmas (10) and (11)). Let $\tau(j)=\{i\in\mathcal{N}_j : c(i,\,j)\leq c(j,\,\sigma(j))\}$ for $j\in\mathcal{C}_S$ and, $=\mathcal{N}_j$ for $j\in\mathcal{C}_D$. We next define our LP (LP_2) so as to open at least γ_r facilities in $\cup_{j\in G^1_r}\tau(j)$ and $\max\{0,\,q'_r-1\}$ facilities in $\cup_{j\in G^2_r}\tau(j)$. Note that G^2_r has only sparse clusters in it. Let $S^1_r=G^1_r$, $s^1_r=\gamma_r$ and $S^2_r=G^2_r$, $s^2_r=\max\{0,\,q'_r-1\}$. Also, let $\mathcal{F}'=\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{B}'=\mathcal{B}$.

$$\textit{Min. Cost}(w)=\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j\Big(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} c(i,\,j)w_i+c(j,\,\sigma(j))\Big(1-\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} w_i\Big)\Big)+u\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_D}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w_i c(i,\,j)$$

$$\textit{subject to}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w_i\leq 1 \qquad \forall\, j\in\mathcal{C}_S \tag{6}$$

$$\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w_i\geq\lfloor d_j/u\rfloor \qquad \forall\, j\in\mathcal{C}_D \tag{7}$$

$$\sum_{j\in S^1_r}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w_i\geq s^1_r \quad \forall\, G^1_r : s^1_r\neq 0 \tag{8}$$

$$\sum_{j\in S^2_r}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w_i\geq s^2_r \quad \forall\, G^2_r : s^2_r\neq 0 \tag{9}$$

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}'} f_i w_i\leq\mathcal{B}' \tag{10}$$

$$0\leq w_i\leq 1 \qquad \forall i\in\mathcal{F}' \tag{11}$$

Constraint (6) ensures that the opened facilities are well spread out amongst the clusters as no more than 1 facility is opened in a sparse cluster. Constraint (7) makes certain that at least $\lfloor d_j/u \rfloor$ facilities are opened in a dense cluster j. Constraint (8) and (9) ensure that at least γ_r and $\max\{0,\, q'_r-1\}$ facilities are opened in G_r^1 and G_r^2 respectively. Constraint (10) guarantees that opened facilities are within the available budget.

▶ **Lemma 7.** *A feasible solution w' to LP_2 can be obtained such that $Cost(w') \leq (2l+13)LP_{opt}$.*

Proof. Consider a MC G_r. For $i \in \tau(j)$, $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, set $w'_i = l_i/u \leq y^*_i$. If $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$, set $w'_i = x^*_{ij} \leq y^*_i$ for $i \in \tau(j)$ and $w'_i = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \tau(j)$. We will next show that the solution is feasible:
Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$, $\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i \leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} w'_i = \sum_{i\in\tau(j)} x^*_{ij} \leq 1$.
Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, $\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} l_i/u \geq \lfloor d_j/u \rfloor$.
For $G_r^1 \neq \emptyset$, $\sum_{j\in G_r^1}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i = \sum_{i\in\tau(j):j\in G_r^1\cap\mathcal{C}_D} l_i/u + \sum_{i\in\tau(j):j\in G_r^1\cap\mathcal{C}_S} x^*_{ij} = \Delta(say)$.
For $res(j_d) < \epsilon$, we have $G_r^1 \cap \mathcal{C}_S = \emptyset$. Hence, $\Delta = d_{j_d}/u \geq \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor (= \gamma_r)$.
For $res(j_d) \geq \epsilon$, if $q_r \geq 1$, $\Delta \geq d_{j_d}/u + (1 - 1/l) = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1 (= \gamma_r)$. Else (*i.e.* $q_r = 0$), $\Delta = d_{j_d}/u \geq \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor (= \gamma_r)$.

For G_r^2 with $q'_r \geq 2$, we have $\sum_{j\in G_r^2}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i = \sum_{j\in G_r^2\cap\mathcal{C}_S}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} x^*_{ij} \geq \sum_{j\in G_r^2\cap\mathcal{C}_S}(1-1/l) = q'_r(1-1/l) \geq q'_r - 1$ as $q'_r \leq l$.
Constraint (10) follows as $w'_i \leq y^*_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{F}$.

Next, we bound the cost of objective function. For $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, $\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} u\, c(i,j) w'_i \leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}} c(i,j) x^*_{ij'}$
$\leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}} \big(c(i,j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'}\big) x^*_{ij'}$ by Lemma (3). Summing over all $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, we get

$$u \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_D}\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i c(i,j) \leq (2l+1) LP_{opt} \tag{12}$$

Now consider the part of objective function for $\mathcal{C}_S$. $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} c(i,\ j) w'_i + c(j,\ \sigma(j))(1 - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} w'_i)) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} c(i,\ j) w'_i + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j\setminus\tau(j)} c(i,\ j) w'_i + c(j,\ \sigma(j))(1 - \sum_{i\in\tau(j)} w'_i - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j\setminus\tau(j)} w'_i)) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} c(i,\ j) x^*_{ij} + c(j,\ \sigma(j))(1 - \sum_{i\in\tau(j)} x^*_{ij}))$
$< \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\tau(j)} c(i,\ j) x^*_{ij} + c(j,\ \sigma(j))(1 - \sum_{i\in\tau(j)} x^*_{ij})) + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j\setminus\tau(j)} (c(i,\ j) - c(j,\ \sigma(j))) x^*_{ij})$ as $c(i,\ j) > c(j,\ \sigma(j))\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \tau(j)$
$= \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} c(i,\ j) x^*_{ij} + c(j,\ \sigma(j))(1 - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij}))$. Thus, by equation (5), we have

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}_S} d_j\Big(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} c(i,\ j) w'_i + c(j,\ \sigma(j))\Big(1 - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j} w'_i\Big)\Big) \leq 12 LP_{opt}. \tag{13}$$

Adding equation (12) and (13), we get $Cost(w') \leq (2l+13) LP_{opt}$. ◀

We now present an iterative algorithm that solves LP_2 and outputs a set $\mathcal{A}$ of integrally opened facilities.

Iterative Algorithm: ***Obtaining a pseudo-integral solution***

1. Initialize $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}'$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}'$.
2. **While** $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \neq \emptyset$ **do:**
   - **a.** Compute an extreme point solution $\tilde{w}$ to LP_3.
   - **b.** Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0 = \{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} : \tilde{w}_i = 0\}$. Remove all facilities in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ *i.e.* set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$.
   - **c.** Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1 = \{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} : \tilde{w}_i = 1\}$. Remove all facilities in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and add them to $\mathcal{A}$ *i.e.* set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \sum_{i\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1} f_i \tilde{w}_i$.
   - **d.** **While** $\exists j \in G_r$ such that constraint (6) or (7) is tight:
     - **i.** If $j \in G_r^1 \cap \mathcal{C}_D$, $S_r^1 = S_r^1 \setminus \{j\}$, $s_r^1 = s_r^1 - \lfloor d_j/u \rfloor$. If $s_r^1 = 0$, the constraint is removed.

ii. If $j \in G_r^1 \cap \mathcal{C}_S$, set $S_r^1 = S_r^1 \setminus \{j\}$, $s_r^1 = s_r^1 - 1$. If $s_r^1 = 0$, the constraint is removed.
iii. If $j \in G_r^2$, set $S_r^2 = S_r^2 \setminus \{j\}$, $s_r^2 = s_r^2 - 1$. If $s_r^2 = 0$, the constraint is removed.

e. If there does not exist any $\tilde{w}_i$ that is 0 or 1 then break.

3. Return $\mathcal{A}$.

▶ **Lemma 8.** *The solution $\tilde{w}$ given by Iterative Algorithm satisfies the following: (i) $\tilde{w}$ has at most two fractional facilities, (ii) $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} f_i \tilde{w}_i \leq \mathcal{B}$ and, (iii) $Cost(\tilde{w}) \leq Cost(w') \leq (2l+13) LP_{opt}$.*

Proof. Consider the iteration when the algorithm reaches step (2e). Let the linearly independent tight constraints corresponding to (6) and (7) be denoted as $\mathcal{X}$ and the ones corresponding to (8) and (9) be denoted as $\mathcal{Y}$. Let A be a set of variables corresponding to some constraint in $\mathcal{X}$ and B be a set of variables corresponding to some constraint in $\mathcal{Y}$ such that $A \cap B \neq \phi$. Then, due to laminar nature of constraints, $A \subseteq B$. Imagine deleting A from B and, subtracting 1 if the constraint comes from (6) and $\lfloor d_j/u \rfloor$ if the constraint comes from (7) appropriately from $s_r^1 (/s_r^2)$. Repeat the process with another such constraint in $\mathcal{X}$ until there is no more constraint in $\mathcal{X}$ whose variable set has a non-empty intersection with B. At this point, $s_r^1 (/s_r^2) \geq 1$ (for otherwise the constraints would not be linearly independent) and the number of variables in B is at least 2. Number of variables in any set corresponding to a tight constraint in $\mathcal{X}$ is also at least 2. Thus the total number of variables is at least $2|\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathcal{Y}|$ and the number of tight constraints is at most $|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}| + 1$. Thus, we get $|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}| \leq 1$ and hence there at most two (fractional) variables.

Claim (2) follows as in step (2a), we compute a feasible solution of LP_2, reduce $\mathcal{B}'$ accordingly for subsequent iterations and maintain feasibility in every iteration. Note that no facility is opened in $\mathcal{N}_j \setminus \tau(j) : j \in \mathcal{C}_S$ for if $i \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \tau(j) : j \in \mathcal{C}_S$ is opened, then it can be shut down and the demand $d_j \tilde{w}_i$, can be shipped to $\sigma(j)$, decreasing the cost as $c(j, \sigma(j)) < c(i, j)$. Then, claim (3) follows as we compute extreme point solution in step (2a) in every iteration and the cost never increases in subsequent iterations. ◀

2.3 Obtaining an integrally open solution

Next, we obtain an integrally open solution $\hat{w}$ from $\tilde{w}$ by opening the two fractional facilities (if any) violating the budget by an additional cost of f_{max}. This is captured in the following lemma.

▶ **Lemma 9.** *Given an optimal pseudo-integral solution $\tilde{w}$ for LP_2, an integrally open solution $\hat{w}$ can be obtained such that*

1. $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} f_i \hat{w}_i \leq \mathcal{B} + f_{max}$.
2. $Cost(\hat{w}) \leq Cost(\tilde{w}) \leq (2l+13) LP_{opt}$.

Proof. If there is no fractionally opened facility, then set $\hat{w}_i = \tilde{w}_i \forall i \in \mathcal{F}$. Else, let $\{i_1, i_2\}$ denote the fractionally opened facilities in solution $\tilde{w}$. Note that we must have $\hat{w}_{i_1} + \hat{w}_{i_2} = 1$. Set $\hat{w}_i = \tilde{w}_i \forall i \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$ and set $\hat{w}_{i_1} = 1$, $\hat{w}_{i_2} = 1$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{i_1 \cup i_2\}$.

$f_{i_1} \hat{w}_{i_1} + f_{i_2} \hat{w}_{i_2} = f_{i_1} \tilde{w}_{i_1} + f_{i_1}(1 - \tilde{w}_{i_1}) + f_{i_2} \tilde{w}_{i_2} + f_{i_2}(1 - \tilde{w}_{i_2}) \leq f_{i_1} \tilde{w}_{i_1} + f_{i_2} \tilde{w}_{i_2} + f_{max}(1 - \tilde{w}_{i_1} + 1 - \tilde{w}_{i_2}) = f_{i_1} \tilde{w}_{i_1} + f_{i_2} \tilde{w}_{i_2} + f_{max}(2 - (\tilde{w}_{i_1} + \tilde{w}_{i_2})) = f_{i_1} \tilde{w}_{i_1} + f_{i_2} \tilde{w}_{i_2} + f_{max}$, where the last equality follows because $\tilde{w}_{i_1} + \tilde{w}_{i_2} = 1$. Thus, the budget loss is no more than f_{max} and hence claim (1) holds. Clearly, there is no loss in connection cost. ◀

In the next two lemmas, we prove that these many facilities are sufficient to serve the demands coming onto G_r. Let M be the set of all meta clusters and M_1 be the set of meta clusters, each consisting of exactly one dense and one sparse cluster. MCs in M_1 need special treatment and will be considered separately.

Lemma (10) discusses the capacity and cost bounds with respect to the assignments done within a MC G_r. Lemma (11) deals with the remaining demand that we fail to assign within a MC. Such demand is assigned in the parent MC. Lemma (11) discusses the cost bound for such assignments and the impact of the demand coming onto G_r from the children MC's along with the demand within G_r on capacity.

▶ **Lemma 10.** *Consider a meta-cluster G_r. Suppose the capacities are scaled up by a factor of $2+\epsilon$ for $l \geq 1/\epsilon$. Then, (i) Each dense cluster is* self-sufficient *i.e. its demand can be completely assigned within the cluster itself. (ii) There are at most two clusters, one in G_r^1 and one in G_r^2, with no facility opened in them and they are sparse clusters. (iii) Demands are assigned only to facilities above them in the meta-cluster except for the root cluster of a root meta-cluster. (iv) At most u units of demand in G_r remain un-assigned and it must be in the root cluster of G_r. (v) For $G_r \in M \setminus M_1$, let $\beta_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + \max\{0, q_r - 1\}$, where j_d is the demand of the dense root cluster (if any) in G_r. Then, at least β_r facilities are opened in G_r. (vi) For $G_r \in M_1$, let $\beta_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor$ for case 1 and $= \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1$ for case 2. Then, at least β_r facilities are opened in G_r. (vii) Total distance traveled by demand d_j of $j (\neq r) \in G_r$ to reach the centers of the clusters in which they are served is bounded by $2d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$.*

Proof. At least one facility ($\lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor \geq 1$) is opened in $\mathcal{N}_{j_d}$. Demand $u \cdot res(j_d)$ is assigned to these facilities. Thus dense clusters are self sufficient. $\beta_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor$ if $q_r = 0$. Now onwards, we assume that $q_r \geq 1$.

LP_2 opens $\max\{0, q'_r - 1\}$ facilities in G_r^2 where q'_r is the number of clusters in G_r^2. Constraint (6) ensures that at most one facility is opened in each cluster. Thus, there is at most one cluster in G_r^2 with no facility opened in it and it is a sparse cluster. In case 2 when $G_r^1 = \{j_d, j_s\}$, it is possible that all the γ_r facilities are opened in $\tau(j_d)$ and no facility is opened in $\tau(j_s)$. Thus, there are at most two clusters with no facility opened in them and they are sparse clusters. Let $j \in G_r^2$ such that no facility is opened in $\tau(j)$. If $\sigma(j) \in G_r^2$, then LP_2 must have opened a facility in $\tau(\sigma(j))$. Demand of j is assigned to this facility at a loss of maximum 2 factor in capacity. If $\sigma(j) \notin G_r^2$ then either G_r^1 is empty or $\sigma(j) \in G_r^1$. Consider the first case: j must be the root of G_r. Note that G_r cannot be a root MC in this case for otherwise $\sigma(j)$ would be in G_r^2. Demand d_j of j is then served in the parent meta-cluster; at most u units of demand of G_r remain unassigned within G_r and goes up to the parent MC. It is guaranteed that the demand will be served in the parent meta-cluster within the capacity bounds as shown in the next lemma. Next consider the case that $\sigma(j) \in G_r^1$, then $\sigma(j)$ is either j_d or j_s. We will next show that demand of j will be absorbed in $\tau(j_d) \cup \tau(j_s)$ in the claimed bounds along with claims (v) and (vi) of the lemma.

1. $res(j_d) < \epsilon$, we have $G_r^1 = \{j_d\}$, $\gamma_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor$, $G_r^2 = G_r \cap \mathcal{C}_S$, $q'_r = q_r$, and $\beta_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + q_r - 1$. LP_2 must have opened at least $\lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor \geq 1$ facilities in $\tau(j_d)$ (let i^* be one of them) and at least $q_r - 1$ facilities in G_r^2. In this case, $j = j_s$ and $\sigma(j) = j_d$. Demands $u \cdot res(j_d)$ and d_j are assigned to i^* at a loss of $(2+\epsilon)$ factor in capacity.
2. $\epsilon \leq res(j_d) < 1$, we have $G_r^1 = \{j_d, j_s\}$, $G_r^2 = G_r \cap \mathcal{C}_S \setminus \{j_s\}$, $q'_r = q_r - 1$ and $\gamma_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1$. $\beta_r = \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + q_r - 1$ if $q_r \neq 1$ and $= \lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1$ if $q_r = 1$. LP_2 must have opened at least $\lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1 \geq 2$ facilities in $\tau(j_d) \cup \tau(j_s)$ (let i_1 and i_2 be two of them) and (for $q_r \geq 2$) at least $q_r - 2$ facilities in G_r^2. In this case, $\sigma(j) = j_s$. In the worst case, no facility is opened in $\tau(j_s)$. Demands $u \cdot res(j_d)$, d_{j_s} and d_j are assigned to i_1 and i_2 at a loss of factor 2 in capacity.

Clearly, $c(j, j_d) \leq 2c(j, \sigma(j))$. ◀

▶ **Lemma 11.** *Consider a meta-cluster G_r. The demand of G_r and the demand coming on G_r from the children meta-clusters can be assigned to the facilities opened in G_r such that: (i) Capacities are violated at most by a factor of $(2 + \frac{4}{l-1})$ for $l \geq 1/\epsilon$ and, (ii) Total distance traveled by demand d_j of $j \in \mathcal{C}'$ to reach the centers of the clusters in which they are served is bounded by $l d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$.*

Proof. After assigning the demands of the clusters within G_r as explained in the previous lemma, demand coming from all the children meta-clusters are distributed proportionately to facilities within G_r utilizing the remaining capacities. Next, we will show that this can be done within the claimed capacity bound.

Let G_r be a non leaf meta-cluster with a dense cluster $j_d \in \mathcal{C}_D$ at the root, if any. Note that $G_r \notin M_1$ for $l>2$. The total demand onto the facilities opened in G_r is at most $u(\lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor + 1 + q_r) + u(t_r+1) \leq (\beta_r+2)u + (t_r+1)u$ whereas the total available capacity is at least $\beta_r u$. Thus, the capacity violation is bounded by $\frac{(\beta_r+2)u+(t_r+1)u}{\beta_r u} \leq \frac{(\beta_r+2)u+(\beta_r+2)u}{\beta_r u} = 2+4/\beta_r \leq 2+4/(l-1)$ (as $\lfloor d_{j_d}/u \rfloor \geq p_r$ we have $\beta_r \geq q_r - 1 + p_r = t_r - 1 = l-1$ for a non-leaf MC).

Leaf meta-clusters may have length less than l but they don't have any demand coming onto them from the children meta-cluster thus capacity violation is bounded as explained in the previous lemma. First of all, consider a leaf meta-cluster with only one cluster in it i.e. $t_r = 1$. If no facility is opened in this cluster then it must be sparse and its demand is served by the parent meta-cluster (note that it cannot be a root MC as a root MC with sparse root must have at least 2 clusters in it). If a facility is opened in it then it is self sufficient. Next consider a leaf meta-cluster with exactly two clusters in it. In that case, we must have $\beta_r \geq 1$. Now, either $G_r \in M_1$ or both the clusters are sparse. In the latter case, clearly capacity violation is no more than 2. So let $G_r \in M_1$. If $\lfloor d_j/u \rfloor \geq 2$, then clearly the capacity violation is no more than 2. So let $\lfloor d_j/u \rfloor = 1$. Now we'll have to consider the two cases: In case 1, one facility is opened and total demand is at most $(2+\epsilon)u$. In case 2, two facilities are opened and total demand is at most $3u$. Next consider a leaf meta-cluster with more than two clusters in it. Clearly, it is not in M_1 and $\beta_r \geq 2$. The capacity violation is at most $\frac{(\beta_r+2)u}{\beta_r u} = 1 + 2/\beta_r \leq 2$.

Let j belongs to the MC G_r. Then, either the demand of j is served by a facility in $\tau(\sigma(j))$ within G_r or j is the root of G_r and its demand is served by facilities in clusters of the parent MC, say G_s. Since the edges in G_s are no costlier than the connecting edge $(j, \sigma(j))$ of G_r and there are at most $l-1$ edges in G_s, the total distance traveled by demand d_j of j to reach the centers of the clusters in which they are served is bounded by $l d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$. ◀

Choosing $l \geq 1/\epsilon$ such that $4/(l-1) < \epsilon$ gives us $l \geq 4/\epsilon + 1$. Next, we bound the cost of assigning the demands collected at the centers to the facilities opened in their respective clusters. Let $j \in \mathcal{C}'$. Let $\lambda(j)$ be the set of centers j'' such that facilities in $\tau(j'')$ serve the demand of j. Note that if some facility is opened in $\tau(j)$, then $\lambda(j)$ is $\{j\}$ itself and if no facility is opened in $\tau(j)$, then $\lambda(j) = \{j'' : \exists i \in \tau(j'')$ such that demand of j is served by $i\}$. Further, let g_i be the total demand served by any facility i.

The cost of assigning a part of the demand d_j by a facility opened in $\tau(j'')$, $j'' \in \lambda(j) \cap \mathcal{C}_S$ is bounded differently from the part assigned to facilities in $\tau(j'')$, $j'' \in \lambda(j) \cap \mathcal{C}_D$.

Let $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S \cap \lambda(j)$, $i \in \tau(j'')$. Then, $c(j'', i) \leq c(j'', \sigma(j'')) \leq c(j, \sigma(j))$. Last inequality follows as: either j'' is above j in the same MC (say G_r) (by Lemma (10)) or j'' is in the parent MC (say G_s) (by Lemma (11)) of G_r. In the first case, the edge $(j'', \sigma(j''))$ is either in G_r or is the connecting edge of G_r. The inequality follows as edge costs are non-increasing as we go up the tree. In the latter case, edge $(j'', \sigma(j''))$ is either in G_s or it is the connecting edge of G_s: in either case, $c(j'', \sigma(j'')) \leq c(j, \sigma(j))$ as the connecting edge of G_s is no costlier than the edges in G_s which are no costlier than the connecting edge $(c(j, \sigma(j)))$ of G_r. Summing over all $j, j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S$ and applying the result of Lemma (9), we see that this cost is bounded by $(2l+1)LP_{opt}$.

Next, let $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_D \cap \lambda(j)$. Let $i \in \tau(j'')$. Since $g_i \leq (2+\epsilon)u$, the cost of transporting $(2+\epsilon)u$ units of demand from j'' to i is $(2+\epsilon)u\hat{w}_i c(i, j'')$. Summing it over all $i \in \tau(j'')$, $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_D \cap \lambda(j)$, $j \in \mathcal{C}'$ and applying the result of Lemma (9), we get that the total cost for $\mathcal{C}_D$ is bounded by $(2+\epsilon)(2l+1)LP_{opt}$. Hence we arrive at the following lemma:

▶ **Lemma 12.** *An integrally open solution $\bar{\sigma} = <\bar{x}, \bar{y}>$ to knapsack-median problem instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, c, f, u, \mathcal{B})$ can be obtained with a capacity violation at most $2+\epsilon$ such that $CostKM(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) =$*

$O(1/\epsilon^2)LP_{opt}$ *for a fixed* $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. Set $\bar{y}_i = \hat{w}_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $j \in \mathcal{C}'$. Borrowing notations $\lambda(j)$ and $g_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{F}$ from above. Also, let $\psi(j)$ be the set of facilities in $\lambda(j)$ that serve the demand of j and $\theta(j,j'')$ be the extent to which d_j is served by the facilities in $\mathcal{N}_{j''}$, $j'' \in \lambda(j)$. Let $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) > 0$. For $j'' \in \lambda(j)$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}$, set $\bar{x}_{ij'} = (g_i / \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}) \theta(j,j'') \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$. For detailed proof, see Appendix 6.1. ◀

3 Capacitated Facility Location Problem

In Capacitated Facility Location Problem, we are given a set of clients $\mathcal{C}$, a set of facilities $\mathcal{F}$ and a real valued distance function $c(i, j)$ on $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{C}$ in metric space, each facility i has facility opening cost f_i and capacity u_i while each client has unit demand. The goal is to open a set of facilities and assign clients to them so as to minimize the total facility opening cost and connection cost. We deal with the case when $u_i = u \ \forall i$ and denote it by *unif-FLP*. In this section, we present a constant factor approximation for the problem The natural LP-relaxation for instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, c, f, u)$ of *unif-FLP* is given as follows.

$$LP_3\text{: } \textit{Minimize } \mathcal{C}ostFLP(x,y) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} f_i y_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} c(i, j) x_{ij}$$

$$\textit{subject to} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{C} \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} x_{ij} \leq u \, y_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F} \tag{15}$$

$$x_{ij} \leq y_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, \, j \in \mathcal{C} \tag{16}$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0, \, y_i \geq 0$$

Let $\mathcal{C}ostFLP(x,y) = Cost_f(\sigma, T) + Cost_s(\sigma, T)$ denote the total opening cost and the connection cost paid by all clients for getting service from a given subset of facilities T under solution $\sigma = <x,y>$. Let $\sigma^* = <x^*, y^*>$ denote the optimal solution of LP_3. Clusters are formed the same way as in knapsack median with $l = 2$. Sparse clusters are easy to handle in this case as there is no budget on the cost of opened facilities. For a sparse cluster centered at j, we open the cheapest facility i^* in *ball(j)*, close all other facilities in the cluster and shift their demands to i^*. Let $\hat{\sigma} = <\hat{x}, \hat{y}>$ be the solution so obtained.

▶ **Lemma 13.** *The solution* $\hat{\sigma} = <\hat{x}, \hat{y}>$ *satisfies the following:*

1. *it is integrally open in* $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}$ *and feasible.*
2. $Cost(\hat{\sigma}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) \leq O(1) LP_{opt}$.

Proof. For each $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$, claim (1) follows as i^* is fully open and $d_j < u$. Next, we prove claim (2). Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_S$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$ and $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $x^*_{ij'} > 0$. Then, by Lemma (3), $c(j, j') \leq 2c(i, j') + 2\mathcal{R}_{j'}$. Also, since $i^* \in ball(j)$, we have $c(i^*, j) \leq \mathcal{R}_j$. Thus, $c(i^*, j') \leq c(j, j') + c(i^*, j) \leq c(j, j') + \mathcal{R}_j$. If $\mathcal{R}_j < c(j, j')$ then $c(i^*, j') < 2c(j, j') \leq 4c(i, j') + 4\mathcal{R}_{j'}$ else $c(i^*, j') \leq 2\mathcal{R}_j \leq 4\mathcal{R}_{j'} \leq 4c(i, j') + 4\mathcal{R}_{j'}$ where the second inequality in the else part follows by Lemma (4). Hence, $c(i^*, j')\hat{x}_{i^*j'} = c(i^*, j') \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij'} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij'} c(i^*, j') \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{ij'} (4c(i, j') + 4R_{j'})$. Thus,

$Cost_s(j', \hat{\sigma}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) \leq 4Cost_s(j', \sigma^*, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) + 8\hat{C}_{j'} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S})$ —(1)

Also,

$Cost_f(\hat{\sigma}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) \leq 2Cost_f(\sigma^*, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S})$ —(2)

Equation (2) follows as i^* is cheapest and $size(y^*, ball(j)) \geq 1/2$. Adding equation (1) over all $j' \in \mathcal{C}$, we get

$Cost_s(\hat{\sigma}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) \leq 4Cost_s(\sigma^*, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}) + 8 \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{C}_{j'} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S})$ —(3)

Adding equation (2) and (3) we get claim (2).

◀

We next define some more notations which will be useful. Let CI-$Cost_f(z, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}} f_i z_i$ denote the total facility opening cost paid by all $i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}$ under a solution z. Further, let l_i be the assignment of the demand of j to facility i in $\mathcal{N}_j$ with z_i opening i.e. $l_i = uz_i$, then, CI-$Cost_s(z, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_D} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j) l_i$, denote the total service cost paid by all $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$ for getting served by facilities in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}$ under solution z. Then, $Cost_{CI}(z, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}) =$ CI-$Cost_f(z, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D})$+ CI-$Cost_s(z, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D})$.

For dense clusters, we obtain what we call an *almost integral* solution, within each cluster. A solution is said to be *almost integral* if at most one facility is opened fractionally. We first define the notion of cluster instances. Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$. Define the following linear program for cluster instance: $S(j, \mathcal{N}_j, d_j, b_j)$, with $b_j = b_j^f + b_j^c$, where $b_j^f = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} y_i^* f_i$ is the budget on facility opening cost and $b_j^c = \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} x_{ij'}^* (c(i, j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'})$ is the budget on connection cost.

LP_4: *Minimize* $\mathcal{C}ostFLP_j(z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} (f_i + uc(i, j)) z_i$

$$\text{subject to } u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_i = d_j \tag{17}$$

$$0 \le z_i \le 1 \tag{18}$$

where z denotes a solution to the cluster instance.

▶ **Lemma 14.** *Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, for cluster instance $S(j, \mathcal{N}_j, d_j, b_j)$, a feasible solution z can be obtained such that*

1. $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_i \le \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} y_i^*$ *i.e.* $size(z, \mathcal{N}_j) \le size(y^*, \mathcal{N}_j)$ *and,*
2. $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} (f_i + uc(i, j)) z_i \le b_j^f + b_j^c$

Proof. Let $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$. Set $z_i = \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} x_{ij'}^* / u = \frac{l_i}{u} \le y_i^*$. We will show that z so defined is a feasible solution to the cluster instance. $u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} l_i = d_j$. Also, $u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j) z_i = u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j) \left(\frac{\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} x_{ij'}^*}{u} \right) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} c(i, j) x_{ij'}^* \le \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \left(c(i, j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'} \right) x_{ij'}^* = b_j^c$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} f_i z_i \le \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} f_i y_i^*$. Also,
$size(z, \mathcal{N}_j) \le size(y^*, \mathcal{N}_j)$ follows as $z_i \le y_i^*$. ◀

▶ **Lemma 15.** *For a feasible solution z to a cluster instance centered at $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, we can construct an almost integral solution z' with $size(z', \mathcal{N}_j) = size(z, \mathcal{N}_j)$ without increasing the cost.*

Proof. Arrange the fractionally opened facilities in z in non-decreasing order of $f_i + uc(i, j)$ and greedily transfer the total opening $size(z, \mathcal{N}_j)$ to them. Let z' denote the new openings. Let $l'_i = z'_i u$. Note that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} l'_i = u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} z'_i = u \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_i = d_j$. Clearly, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} (f_i + c(i, j)u)\ z'_i \le \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} (f_i + c(i, j)u)\ z_i \le b_j^f + b_j^c$.

◀

▶ **Lemma 16.** *Let $d_j \ge u$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ be fixed. Given an almost integral solution z' and assignment l' as obtained in Lemma (15), an integrally open solution $\hat{z}$ and assignment $\hat{l}$ (possibly fractional) can be obtained such that*

1. $\hat{l}_i \le (1+\epsilon) \hat{z}_i u\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_j$, *and* $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \hat{l}_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} l'_i = d_j$

2. $Cost_{CI}(\hat{z}, \mathcal{N}_j) \leq (1/\epsilon)\ Cost_{CI}(z', \mathcal{N}_j) \leq (1/\epsilon)(b_j^f + b_j^c)$

Proof. We will construct solution $\hat{z}$ and assignment $\hat{l}$ such that they satisfy the following equations along with the claims (1) and (2):

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} f_i \hat{z}_i \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} f_i z'_i \ \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_D, \tag{19}$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j)\hat{l}_i \leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} c(i, j) l'_i \ \forall j \in \mathcal{C}_D \tag{20}$$

Adding (19) and (20) we get claim (2). We now proceed to prove claims (1), (19) and (20). If there is no fractionally open facility, we do nothing, i.e. set $\hat{z} = z'$. Else, there is exactly one fractional facility, say i_1, and at least one integral facility, say i_2, as $size(z', \mathcal{N}_j) \geq 1$. There are two possibilities w.r.t i_1,

1. $z'_{i_1} < \epsilon$
2. $z'_{i_1} \geq \epsilon$

In first case, close i_1 and shift its demand to i_2 at a loss of factor $(1+\epsilon)$ in its capacity. Note that $l'_{i_1} < \epsilon u$ while $l'_{i_2} = u$. Thus, set $\hat{z}_{i_1} = 0$, $\hat{l}_{i_1} = 0$ and $\hat{l}_{i_2} = l'_{i_1} + l'_{i_2} < (1+\epsilon)u = (1+\epsilon)u\hat{z}_{i_2}$. Also, $\hat{l}_{i_2} \leq (1+\epsilon) l'_{i_2}$. Then, $c(i_2, j)\hat{l}_{i_2} \leq (1+\epsilon)\ c(i_2, j) l'_{i_2}$. There is no loss in facility cost in this case.

In second case, simply open i_1, at a loss of $1/\epsilon$ in facility cost. Set $\hat{z}_{i_1} = 1$. Then, $f_{i_1}\hat{z}_{i_1} \leq (1/\epsilon) f_{i_1} z'_{i_1}$. There is no loss in connection cost in this case.

$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \hat{l}_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} l'_i = d_j$ holds clearly. ◀

▶ **Lemma 17.** *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ be fixed. An integrally open solution $\bar{\sigma} = <\bar{x}, \bar{y}>$ to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, c, f, u)$ can be obtained such that,*

1. $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij} \leq (1+\epsilon)\bar{y}_i u \ \forall i \in \mathcal{F}$,
2. $CostFLP(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq O(1/\epsilon) LP_{opt}$.

Proof. Set $\bar{y}_i = \hat{y}_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}$, $\bar{y}_i = \hat{z}_i \ \forall\ i\ \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}$ and $\bar{x}_{ij'} = \hat{x}_{ij'} \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}$, $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ and for $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, $j' \in \mathcal{C}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$, let $\bar{x}_{ij'} = \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{i'j'} = \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$. For detailed proof, see Appendix 6.2. ◀

4 Capacitated k- Facility Location Problem

In this section, we combine the techniques developed in the previous sections to fix the issues raised in section 2.1. We first obtain an almost integral solution in each sparse cluster, centered at j, by opening the cheapest facility i^* in *ball(j)* to an extent of $\min\{size(y^*, \mathcal{N}_j), 1\}$, closing all other facilities in the cluster and shifting their demands to i^*. There is no loss in facility cost and the connection is bounded in the same manner as in Lemma (13). Let $\hat{\sigma} = <\hat{x}, \hat{y}>$ be the solution so obtained. Then it can be shown that $(1 - \hat{y}_i) d_j c(j, \sigma(j)) \leq 8 b_j^c$ (see appendix 6.3). For $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, an almost integral solution z' with $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} (f_i + c(i, j)u)\ z'_i \leq 5 LP_{opt}$ is obtained in a similar manner as in Section 3 without increasing the cardinality.

Now the cost of transporting the demands from the centers to the facilities can be bounded in the similar manner as described for CKM in section 2: Let $j \in \mathcal{C}'$, $i \in \tau(j)$, $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S \cap \lambda(j)$, $i'' \in \tau(j'')$, $c(j'',\ i'') \leq c(j'',\ \sigma(j'')) \leq c(j,\ \sigma(j))$. Hence, $(1 - \hat{y}_i) d_j c(j'',\ i'') \leq (1 - \hat{y}_i) d_j c(j,\ \sigma(j)) \leq 8 b_j^c$. Thus, summing over all $j, j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S$ we see that this cost is bounded by $O(1) LP_{opt}$. Next, let $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_D \cap \lambda(j), i'' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}$. Since $g_{i''} \leq (2+\epsilon)u$ and the cost of transporting u units of demand from j'' to i'' is bounded, summing over all $i'' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}$ and $j'' \in \mathcal{C}_D \cap \lambda(j)$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}'$, we get that the total cost for $\mathcal{C}_D$ is bounded by $5(2+\epsilon) LP_{opt}$.

Finally, using the above techniques (deterministic) pipage rounding cannot be used to open the facilities instead of dependent rounding as only $(1 - \hat{y}_i) d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$ is bounded and we need to bound

$d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$. An LP similar to LP_2 provides us this bound in an appropriate manner. That is to say that our techniques for CKM provides similar results for $CkFLP$ with $(2+\epsilon)$ factor violation in capacity, violating the cardinality by plus 1. The violation of cardinality can be avoided by opening the facility with larger opening integrally while converting a pseudo integral solution into an integrally open solution. Thus we present the first deterministic constant factor approximation for the problem violating the capacities by $(2+\epsilon)$ factor.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we presented first constant factor approximation algorithm for uniform hard capacitated knapsack median problem violating the budget by an additional cost of f_{max} in the facility opening cost and a loss of factor $2+\epsilon$ in capacity. We also gave a constant factor $(O(1/\epsilon))$ approximation for uniform capacitated facility location at a loss of $(1+\epsilon)$ in capacity. The result shows that the natural LP is not too bad. We raised some issues with the proofs presented in [4] for capacitated k facility location problem and then showed that they can be resolved using our techniques. We also give the first deterministic constant factor algorithm for the problem violating capacities by a factor of $2+\epsilon$.

It would be interesting to see if we can either drop ϵ from the capacity violation or avoid f_{max} loss in the budget using the same LP. Another direction to extend the work would be to consider non-uniform capacities. Conflicting requirement of facility costs and capacities makes the problem challenging.

References

1 Karen Aardal, Pieter L. van den Berg, Dion Gijswijt, and Shanfei Li. Approximation algorithms for hard capacitated k-facility location problems. *EJOR,*, 242(2):358–368, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2014.10.011.

2 Ankit Aggarwal, Anand Louis, Manisha Bansal, Naveen Garg, Neelima Gupta, Shubham Gupta, and Surabhi Jain. A 3-approximation algorithm for the facility location problem with uniform capacities. *Journal of Mathematical Programming*, 141(1-2):527–547, 2013.

3 Hyung-Chan An, Mohit Singh, and Ola Svensson. Lp-based algorithms for capacitated facility location. In *FOCS, 2014,*, pages 256–265.

4 Jaroslaw Byrka, Krzysztof Fleszar, Bartosz Rybicki, and Joachim Spoerhase. Bi-factor approximation algorithms for hard capacitated k-median problems. In *SODA 2015,*, pages 722–736.

5 Jaroslaw Byrka, Thomas Pensyl, Bartosz Rybicki, Joachim Spoerhase, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. An improved approximation algorithm for knapsack median using sparsification. In *ESA 2015*, pages 275–287.

6 Moses Charikar and Sudipto Guha. Improved combinatorial algorithms for facility location problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34(4):803–824, 2005.

7 Moses Charikar and Shi Li. A dependent lp-rounding approach for the k-median problem. In *ICALP 2012,*, pages 194–205.

8 Sapna Grover, Neelima Gupta, and Aditya Pancholi. Constant factor approximation algorithms for uniform hard capacitated facility location problems: Natural LP is not too bad. *CoRR*, abs/1606.08022, 2016.

9 Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Amit Kumar, Viswanath Nagarajan, Yogish Sabharwal, and Barna Saha. The matroid median problem. In *SODA, 2011*, pages 1117–1130.

10 Amit Kumar. Constant factor approximation algorithm for the knapsack median problem. In *SODA, 2012*, pages 824–832.

11 Chaitanya Swamy. Improved approximation algorithms for matroid and knapsack median problems and applications. In *APPROX/RANDOM, 2014*, pages 403–418, 2014.

6 Appendix

6.1 Detailed proof of Lemma (12)

Choosing $l \geq 2/\epsilon$ such that $4/(l-1) < \epsilon$ gives us $l \geq 4/\epsilon + 1$. Let $j \in \mathcal{C}'$. Let $\lambda(j)$ be the set of centers j'' such that facilities in $\tau(j'')$ serve the demand of j. Note that if some facility is opened in $\tau(j)$, then $\lambda(j)$ is $\{j\}$ itself and if no facility is opened in $\tau(j)$,then $\lambda(j) = \{j'' : \exists i \in \tau(j'')$ such that demand of j is served by $i\}$. Further, let g_i be the total demand served by any facility i. Then, set $\bar{y}_i = \hat{w}_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) > 0$. For $j'' \in \lambda(j)$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}$, set $\bar{x}_{ij'} = (g_i / \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}) \theta(j, j'') \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$.

The cost of assigning a part of the demand d_j by a facility opened in $\lambda(j) \cap \mathcal{C}_S$ is bounded differently from the part assigned to facilities in $\lambda(j) \cap \mathcal{C}_D$.

$$\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij'} = \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}} \right) \theta(j, j'') \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$$

$$= \left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}} \right) \theta(j, j'') \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) = \left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}} \right) \theta(j, j'') d_j$$

Summing over $j \in \mathcal{C}'$,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij'} = \left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}} \right) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \theta(j, j'') d_j = g_i \quad \text{— (1)}$$

as $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} \theta(j, j'') d_j = \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} g_{i'}$

From Lemma (3), the cost of consolidating the demands at the centers of the clusters is bounded as follows:

$$\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} c(j, j') \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) \leq 2(l+1) LP_{opt} \quad \text{—(2)}$$

Let J_2 be the set of sparse clusters in which no facility is opened and J_1 be the remaining ones *i.e.* $J_1 = \mathcal{C}_S \setminus J_2$. Then, $\lambda(j) = \{j\} \ \forall j \in J_1$. Let $j \in J_1$ and $i^*(j)$ be the facility opened in $\tau(j)$.

$$\sum_{j \in J_1} \sum_{j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S \cap \lambda(j)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} \bar{x}_{ij'} c(i, j'') = \sum_{j \in J_1} \bar{x}_{i^*(j)j'} c(i^*(j), j)$$

Summing over $j' \in \mathcal{C}$, we get

$$\sum_{j \in J_1} \sum_{j'' \in \mathcal{C}_S \cap \lambda(j)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{j''}} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij'} c(i, j'') = \sum_{j \in J_1} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{i^*(j)j'} c(i^*(j), j) = \sum_{j \in J_1} d_j c(i^*(j), j)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in J_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} d_j \hat{w}_i c(i, j) \text{—(3)}$$

For $j \in J_2$, we have $d_j = \sum_{j'' \in \lambda(j)} \theta(j, j'') d_j$. Using Lemma (11), the cost of moving the demand d_j to the centers in $\lambda(j)$ is bounded as follows:

$$\sum_{j'' \in \lambda(j)} \theta(j, j'') d_j c(j, j'') \leq l d_j c(j, \sigma(j))$$

Summing over $j \in J_2$ and applying Lemma (9), we get

$$\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j''\in\lambda(j)}\theta(j,j'')d_jc(j,\,j'')\leq l\sum_{j\in J_2}d_jc(j,\,\sigma(j))(1-\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\hat{w}_i)\leq l(2l+13)LP_{opt}\ \text{—(4)}$$

Next, we bound the cost of assigning the demands collected at the centers in $\lambda(j)$s to the facilities opened in their respective clusters. The cost of assigning a part of the demand d_j in a facility opened in $\lambda(j)\cap\mathcal{C}_S$ is bounded differently from the part assigned to facilities in $\lambda(j)\cap\mathcal{C}_D$.

Let $j''\in\mathcal{C}_S\cap\lambda(j)$, $i\in\tau(j'')$. Then, $c(j'',\,i)\leq c(j'',\,\sigma(j''))\leq c(j,\,\sigma(j))$. Last inequality follows as: either j'' is above j in the same MC (by Lemma (10)) or j'' is in the parent MC (say G_s) of the MC (say G_r) to which j belongs. In the first case, the inequality follows as edge costs are non-increasing as we go up the tree. In the latter case, edges $(j'',\,\sigma(j''))$ is either in G_s or it is the connecting edge of G_s: in either case, $c(j'',\,\sigma(j''))\leq c(j,\,\sigma(j))$ as the edges in G_s are no costlier than the edges in G_r.

$$\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_S\cap\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\bar{x}_{ij'}c(i,\,j'')$$

$$=\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_S\cap\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i'\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}g_{i'}}\right)\theta(j,j'')\mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j',\mathcal{N}_j)c(i,\,j'')$$

$$=\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_S\cap\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i'\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}g_{i'}}\right)\theta(j,j'')d_jc(i,\,j'')$$

$$\leq\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_S\cap\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\left(\frac{g_i}{\sum_{i'\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}g_{i'}}\right)\theta(j,j'')d_jc(j,\,\sigma(j))$$

$$\leq\sum_{j\in J_2}d_jc(j,\,\sigma(j))$$

$$=\sum_{j\in J_2}d_j(1-\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}\hat{w}_i)c(j,\,\sigma(j))\text{—(5)}$$

Next, let $j''\in\mathcal{C}_D\cap\lambda(j)$,$i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}$. Multiplying both sides of (1) by $c(i,\,j'')$, we get

$\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\bar{x}_{ij'}c(i,\,j'')\leq\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}'}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\bar{x}_{ij'}c(i,\,j'')=g_ic(i,\,j'')\leq(2+4/(l-1))u\hat{w}_ic(i,\,j'')$ by Lemma (11).

Summing over all $i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}$ and $j''\in\mathcal{C}_D\cap\lambda(j)$, and then applying equation (3)

$$\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_D\cap\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\sum_{j\in J_2}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\bar{x}_{ij'}c(i,\,j'')\leq(2+4/(l-1))u\sum_{j''\in\mathcal{C}_D}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\hat{w}_ic(i,\,j'')\ \text{—(6)}$$

The above equation bounds the cost of leaving the total demand accumulated at j'' (from J_2) and including the demand of j'' itself. Also, recall that for $j\in\mathcal{C}_D$, $\lambda(j)=\{j\}$.

Adding (3), (5) and (6) and applying Lemma (9), we get

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}'}\sum_{j''\in\lambda(j)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}_{j''}}\sum_{j'\in\mathcal{C}}\bar{x}_{ij'}c(i,\,j'')\leq(2+4/(l-1))(2l+13)LP_{opt}\ \text{—(7)}$$

Adding (2), (4) and (7), we get that the total connection cost is bounded by $l(2l+13)LP_{opt}+(2+4/(l-1))(2l+13)LP_{opt}+2(l+1)LP_{opt}=O(l^2)LP_{opt}=O(1/\epsilon^2)LP_{opt}$.

6.2 Detailed proof of Lemma (17)

Set $\bar{y}_i = \hat{y}_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}$, $\bar{y}_i = \hat{z}_i \ \forall \ i \ \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}$ and $\bar{x}_{ij'} = \hat{x}_{ij'} \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_S}$, $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ and for $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, $j' \in \mathcal{C}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$, let $\bar{x}_{ij'} = \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_j} x^*_{i'j'} = \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$. Clearly, $\bar{x}_{ij'} \leq \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \leq 1 = \hat{z}_i = \bar{y}_i$, and $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{\sigma}}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \bar{x}_{ij'} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) = \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j)$. Then, the following holds:
a. $\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij'} \leq (1+\epsilon) \bar{y}_i u \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}$,
b. $Cost(\bar{\sigma}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}) \leq O(1/\epsilon) LP_{opt}$

Claim (a) follows from Lemma (16) as follows: Let $j \in \mathcal{C}_D, i \in \mathcal{N}_j, j' \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, $\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{x}_{ij'} = \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{\hat{l}_i}{d_j} \mathcal{A}_{\sigma^*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) = \hat{l}_i \leq (1+\epsilon) u \ \hat{z}_i = (1+\epsilon) u \ \bar{y}_i$.

From Lemma (3), we have $\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}'} c(j, j') \mathcal{A}_{\sigma*}(j', \mathcal{N}_j) \leq 6 LP_{opt}$ —(1).

From Lemma (3), we also have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_D} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \left(c(i, j') + 4\hat{C}_{j'} \right) x^*_{ij'} \leq 5 LP_{opt}$.

Summing claim (2) of Lemma (16) over all $j \in \mathcal{C}_D$, we get

$Cost_{CI}(\hat{z}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}) \leq (1/\epsilon) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_D} (b^f_j + b^c_j) = (1/\epsilon) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}} f_i y^*_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_D} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} \left(c(i, j') + 4\hat{C}_{j'} \right) x^*_{ij'}$

$\leq (1/\epsilon) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_D}} f_i y^*_i + 5 LP_{opt} = O(1/\epsilon) LP_{opt}$ —(2).

Adding equation (1) and (2), we get claim (b), which along with claim (2) of Lemma (13) implies the desired bound.

6.3 Proof of property (iv') *i.e.* $(1-y'_i) d_j c(j, \sigma(j)) \leq 8 b^c_j$ of [4]

The following equation is proved as a part of the proof in the paper [4]. Though there is a flaw in this proof but it is rectifiable using our Lemma (4).

Let $i' \in \mathcal{N}_j$ and $j' \in \mathcal{C}$.

$$(1-y'_i) c(j, \eta(j)) \leq 4(c(i', j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'}) \tag{21}$$

Multiplying the above equation by $x^*_{i'j'}$ to both the sides, we get

$$x^*_{i'j'}(1-y'_i) c(j, \eta(j)) \leq 4 x^*_{i'j'}(c(i', j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'}) \tag{22}$$

Summing the above equation over all $j' \in \mathcal{C}$ and $i' \in \mathcal{N}_j$ on both the sides, we get

$$\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} x^*_{i'j'}(1-y'_i) c(j, \eta(j)) \leq 4 \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} x^*_{i'j'}(c(i', j') + 2l\hat{C}_{j'}) = 4 b^c_j \tag{23}$$

$$(1-y'_i) c(j, \eta(j)) \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_j} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}} x^*_{i'j'} \leq 4 b^c_j \tag{24}$$

$$(1-y'_i) c(j, \eta(j)) d_j \leq 4 b^c_j \tag{25}$$

which implies,

$$(1-y'_i) d_j c(j, \sigma(j)) \leq 8 b^c_j \tag{26}$$